arXiv:1410.4065v1 [cs.FL] 15 Oct 2014

Unified Analysis of Collapsible and Ordered Pushdown Automata via Term Rewriting

Lorenzo Clemente

October 16, 2014

Abstract

We model collapsible and ordered pushdown systems with term rewriting, by encoding higher-order stacks and multiple stacks into trees. We show a uniform inverse preservation of recognizability result for the resulting class of term rewriting systems, which is obtained by extending the classic saturation-based approach. This result subsumes and unifies similar analyses on collapsible and ordered pushdown systems. Despite the rich literature on inverse preservation of recognizability for term rewrite systems, our result does not seem to follow from any previous study.

Introduction. Modelling complex systems requires to strike the right balance between the accuracy of the model, and the complexity of its analysis. A particularly successful case is that of *pushdown systems* [5, 17], which can be used to model programs with recursive procedures. A pushdown is an unbounded data structure which makes pushdown systems more expressive than finite-state systems, and yet their reachability analysis still admits efficient (i.e., polynomial time) algorithms. A standard technique to solve the reachability problem for pushdown systems is the so-called *saturation-based approach* [5, 17], where ordinary finite automata representing potentially infinite sets of pushdown configurations are manipulated until the full reachability set has been computed.

There has recently been an effort to model more complex features of recursive programs. In one line of research, *multi-threaded recursive programs*, i.e., concurrent programs where each thread consists of a recursive program, have been modelled by multi-pushdown systems. Since two pushdowns can already simulate the behaviour of a Turing machine (cf. [24]), various restrictions have been proposed to obtain a model with a decidable reachability analysis. Instances include *context-bounding* [23], where the automaton can access a different stack only a bounded number of times, the more general *phase-bounding* [29], with a similar restriction but only on pop operations (i.e., push operations are always allowed), and *scope-bounding* [28], which generalises context-bounding in a different direction by requiring a bounded number of contexts only within the same scope (i.e., between a push and its matching pop). Yet another restriction is to consider *ordered multi-pushdown systems* [8] (later corrected in [2]), where

the pushdowns are linearly ordered, push operations are unrestricted, but a pop on a stack destroys the contents of all previous stacks. Reachability analysis of ordered multi-pushdown systems is 2EXPTIME-complete [2], and an optimal saturation-based procedure has been proposed by Atig [1].

In another line of research, *higher-order recursive programs* are addressed, i.e., programs where functions can be passed as parameters to other functions. Higher-order features like this are nowadays present in all major programming languages, such as C++, Java, Haskell, Python, Scala, Scheme, Erlang, and others. In order to model higher-order recursion, pushdown systems have been generalised to *collapsible pushdown systems* [19] (later simplified to *annotated pushdown systems* [9]), where the pushdown is now a nested stack-of-stacks structure, and basic symbols carry links/annotations to the state of the pushdown at the time when they where pushed on the stack. Reachability analysis of order-n collapsible/annotated pushdown systems is $(n-1)$-EXPTIME-complete, where ordinary pushdown systems correspond to the order-1 case. Also in this case, an optimal saturation-based procedure has been proposed by Broadbent et al. [9], and later implemented in the tool C-SHORe [10].

Inverse preservation of recognisability. The two decidability results above by Atig and Broadbent et al. for, resp., ordered and collapsible/annotated pushdown systems are instances of what is called *inverse preservation of recognisability* in the area of term-rewrite systems. More precisely, by representing a possibly infinite set of target configurations T by some extended finite automaton $\mathcal{A}$, the saturation procedure produces an automaton $\mathcal{B}$ of the same kind recognising the backward reachability set $\mathrm{Pre}^*(T)$, i.e., all those configurations that can reach T in a finite number of steps. This approach requires to either encode generalised pushdowns into ordinary strings and use standard finite automata, or to develop ad-hoc extensions of finite automata working directly on generalised pushdowns.

The two approaches are equivalent, but have different merits. Encoding multi-/annotated pushdowns into ordinary strings has the advantage to use a standard notion of recognisability of sets of configurations at the expense of a cumbersome saturation procedure. Seth gives a simple encoding of multi-pushdowns into simple strings [26]. The result by Atig [1] shows inverse preservation of recognisability for sets of configurations of ordered pushdown automata, where configurations are linearised with the encoding of Seth.

On the other side, using a extended notion of finite automaton specialised to work directly on generalised pushdowns has the advantage that the saturation procedure has a much more natural presentation, at the expense of the need to define a new, ad-hoc notion of finite automata. This is the approach followed by Broadbent et al. [9], who define a notion of higher-order stack automata to read in a nested fashion annotated pushdowns. Note that higher-order stack automata can be converted into ordinary finite automata by using the string encoding of annotated pushdowns proposed by [6]. Therefore, higher-order stack automata still recognise only recognisable sets of annotated pushdown config-

urations. The result by Broadbent et al. [9] shows inverse preservation of recognisability for sets of configurations of annotated pushdown automata.

A term-rewriting approach. We propose to use tree automata techniques to provide a solution covering both the results of Atig and Broadbent et al. in a uniform framework. We propose to encode multi- and annotated pushdowns as *trees* (i.e., first-order terms), and to use ordinary tree automata to represent sets of configurations. Then, transition rules for multi- and annotated pushdown systems can be given directly on these trees in the form of *root-rewriting rules* of a restricted class. Finally, by instantiating a generic saturation procedure on the resulting rewrite rules we can derive in an uniform way the inverse preservation of recognisability results of Atig and Broadbent et al..

This has the following advantages: 1. We do not need to introduce ad-hoc finite automata models to recognise generalised pushdown configurations. We use standard finite tree automata, which comes with the standard notion of recognisable set of finite trees. 2. We obtain simple saturation rules, thanks to the simplicity of the encoding into trees. 3. Our procedure has optimal complexity when instantiated to the specific instances provided by ordered and annotated pushdown systems.

Discussion. Our inverse preservation of recognisability does not seem to follow from the rich literature on term-rewriting systems. Indeed, most results of this kind were proved for different kinds of *bottom-up rewriting*: Starting from the result of Brainerd on *ground rewrite systems* [7], increasingly more general classes of term-rewrite systems were proved to preserve or inverse preserve recognisability, such as *monadic rewrite systems* [25], *semi-monadic rewrite systems* [14], *shallow rewrite systems* [13], *growing rewrite systems* [20, 21], *generalised semi-monadic rewrite systems* [18], *finite-path overlapping rewrite systems* [27], culminating in the most general class of *bottom-up rewrite systems* [15, 16].

Instead, we use root-rewriting, and our term-rewrite systems can be seen as a generalisation on trees of *prefix-rewrite systems*. Preservation of recognisability results for prefix-rewrite systems on words were known since Büchi [11] (cf. also [3, 12] and the book by Book & Otto [4]).

Finally, a class of root-rewriting systems called *generalised growing rewrite systems* has been proposed [22]. Under some additional condition, this class is shown to enjoy inverse preservation of recognisability. Generalised growing rewrite systems are closer in spirit to our class than others, since both use root-rewriting. However, the two classes turn out to be syntactically incomparable.

Acknowledgements. We kindly acknowledge many inspiring discussions on this topic with Igor Walukiewicz.

References

[1] M. F. Atig. Model-checking of ordered multi-pushdown automata. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 8(3), 09 2012.

[2] M. F. Atig, B. Bollig, and P. Habermehl. Emptiness of multi-pushdown automata is 2ETIME-complete. In *Proc. of DLT'08*, pages 121–133, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer-Verlag.

[3] M. Benois. Descendants of regular language in a class of rewriting systems: Algorithm and complexity of an automata construction. In P. Lescanne, editor, *Proc. of RTA'87*, volume 256 of *LNCS*, pages 121–132. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1987.

[4] R. V. Book and F. Otto. *String-rewriting Systems*. Springer-Verlag, 1993.

[5] A. Bouajjani, J. Esparza, and O. Maler. Reachability analysis of pushdown automata: Application to model-checking and saturation method. In *Proc. of CONCUR'97*, volume 1243 of *LNCS*, pages 135–150, 1997.

[6] A. Bouajjani and A. Meyer. Symbolic reachability analysis of higher-order context-free processes. In K. Lodaya and M. Mahajan, editors, *Proc. of FSTTCS'04*, volume 3328 of *LNCS*, pages 135–147. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.

[7] W. S. Brainerd. Tree generating regular systems. *Inform. Control*, 14(2):217 – 231, 1969.

[8] L. Breveglieri, A. Cherubini, C. Citrini, and S. Crespi-Reghizzi. Multi-pushdown languages and grammars. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 7(3):253–292, 1996.

[9] C. Broadbent, A. Carayol, M. Hague, and O. Serre. A saturation method for collapsible pushdown systems. In *Proc. of ICALP'12*, volume 7392 of *LNCS*, pages 165–176, 2012.

[10] C. Broadbent, A. Carayol, M. Hague, and O. Serre. C-SHORe: A collapsible approach to higher-order verification. In *Proc. of ICFP '13*, pages 13–24, New York, NY, USA, 2013. ACM.

[11] R. Büchi. Regular canonical systems. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 6:91–111, 1964. 10.1007/BF01969548.

[12] D. Caucal. On the regular structure of prefix rewriting. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 106(1):61 – 86, 1992.

[13] H. Comon. Sequentiality, monadic second-order logic and tree automata. *Inform. and Comput.*, 157(1–2):25 – 51, 2000.

[14] J.-L. Coquidé, M. Dauchet, R. Gilleron, and S. Vagvolgyi. Bottom-up tree pushdown automata: classification and connection with rewrite systems. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 127(1):69 – 98, 1994.

[15] I. Durand and G. Sénizergues. Bottom-up rewriting is inverse recognizability preserving. In *Proc. of RTA'07*, pages 107–121, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer-Verlag.

[16] I. Durand and M. Sylvestre. Left-linear Bounded TRSs are Inverse Recognizability Preserving. In *Proc. of RTA'11*, volume 10 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 361–376, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2011. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.

[17] A. Finkel, B. Willems, and P. Wolper. A direct symbolic approach to model checking pushdown systems (extended abstract). In *Proc. of INFINITY'97*, volume 9 of *ENTCS*, pages 27–37. Elsevier, 1997.

[18] P. Gyenizse and S. Vágvölgyi. Linear generalized semi-monadic rewrite systems effectively preserve recognizability. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 194(1-2):87–122, Mar. 1998.

[19] M. Hague, A. S. Murawski, C.-H. L. Ong, and O. Serre. Collapsible pushdown automata and recursion schemes. In *Proc. of LICS'08*, pages 452–461, Washington, DC, USA, 2008. IEEE Computer Society.

[20] F. Jacquemard. Decidable approximations of term rewriting systems. In H. Ganzinger, editor, *Proc. of RTA'96*, volume 1103 of *LNCS*, pages 362–376. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 1996.

[21] T. Nagaya and Y. Toyama. Decidability for left-linear growing term rewriting systems. *Inform. and Comput.*, 178(2):499 – 514, 2002.

[22] N. Nitta and H. Seki. An extension of pushdown system and its model checking method. In R. Amadio and D. Lugiez, editors, *Proc. of CONCUR'03*, volume 2761 of *LNCS*, pages 281–295. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2003.

[23] S. Qadeer and J. Rehof. Context-bounded model checking of concurrent software. In *Proc. of TACAS'05*, pages 93–107, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer-Verlag.

[24] G. Ramalingam. Context-sensitive synchronization-sensitive analysis is undecidable. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 22(2):416–430, Mar. 2000.

[25] K. Salomaa. Deterministic tree pushdown automata and monadic tree rewriting systems. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 37(3):367–394, Dec. 1988.

[26] A. Seth. Global reachability in bounded phase multi-stack pushdown systems. In T. Touili, B. Cook, and P. Jackson, editors, *Proc. of CAV'10*, volume 6174 of *LNCS*, pages 615–628. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2010.

[27] T. Takai, Y. Kaji, and H. Seki. Right-linear finite path overlapping term rewriting systems effectively preserve recognizability. In L. Bachmair, editor, *Proc. of RTA'00*, volume 1833 of *LNCS*, pages 246–260. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2000.

[28] S. Torre and M. Napoli. Reachability of multistack pushdown systems with scope-bounded matching relations. In J.-P. Katoen and B. König, editors, *Proc. of CONCUR'11*, volume 6901 of *LNCS*, pages 203–218. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.

[29] S. L. Torre, P. Madhusudan, and G. Parlato. A robust class of context-sensitive languages. In *Proc. of LICS'07*, pages 161–170, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 2007. IEEE Computer Society.